

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/762,721	04/26/2001	Juha Tiihonen	PM277182	PM277182 7520	
909	7590 07/27/2005	EXAMINER			
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP			LEE, CHI HO A		
P.O. BOX 10 MCLEAN, \			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			2663	2663	
			DATE MAILED: 07/27/2009	DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/762,721	TIIHONEN ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Andrew Lee	2663			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 M	av 2005.				
	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 4-14 is/are pending in the appli 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 1, 4-14 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		, ,			
	ammer. Note the attached Office	Action of 1011111 10-132.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau	s have been received. s have been received in Application on the documents have been receive	on No			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list		d.			
		•.			
Attachment(s)	•				
1) M Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) D Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2663

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claims 5, 6, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Re Claim 5, it is unclear what is meant by "... substantially lower than the difference between the measured propagation delay and the current timer value.". Applicant is requested to reference the specification so mete and bounds can be determined.

Same reasoning for claim 6 that recites, "the timer value is increased by a second step which is substantially higher....".

Re Claim 13, it is unclear whether "a equipment" is "first party" and it's relationship to "a second party".

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2663

4. Claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Andresen U.S. Patent Number 6,073,020.

Re Claims 1, 11, fig. 2 teaches the method of handling off at the CU (at least one of the parties) wherein the CU monitors if a need to change for the system time (the timer value) has arisen wherein at step 202 computes a new system time (a value deviating from the initial value wherein the need to change the system time is repeated until the Time to Handoff is reached at step 206 (See col. 5, lines 3-58).

Re Claim 4, refer to Claim 1, wherein the system time (setting of the timer value) is based on the propagation delay measurement associated with the connection section.

Re Claim 10, refer to Claim 1, wherein the system time is inherently on the basis of the location of the mobile station because the system time is adjusted in the handoff region.

Re Claim 12, refer to Claim 1, wherein the using function of claim 11 in a MSC is an intent of use statement.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2663

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andresen U.S. Patent Number 6,073,020 in view of Haartsen U.S. Patent Number 6,021,124.

Re Claim 7, Andresen fails to "...transmitting... a frame...sends an acknowledgement ...frame measuring the time ...arrival of the acknowledgement and deducing the propagation delay therefrom."

However, Haartsen teaches in fig. 3, a Source 16 (party transmitting a frame) transmitting a data packet (a frame) to the destination 18 (the party receiving) whereby the destination 18 transmits an acknowledgement back to the source whereby the source computes the Round trip delay (RTD) (See col. 2, lines 23-34), wherein the RTD is indicative of the propagation delay. One skilled in the art would have motivated by Haartsen to measure the RTD to monitor for data throughput, i.e., longer the RTD, less throughput. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled to combine the teaching of Haartsen into the teaching of Andresen.

7. Claims 8, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andresen U.S. Patent Number 6,073,020 in view of Dent U.S. Patent Number 6,868,270.

Re Claim 8, Andresen fails to explicitly teach the "the need to change the timer is detected from a separate parameter which is read from a database". However, Dent teaches in fig. 4, step 65 receives Satellite Identity Code. It is apparent to one skilled that satellite transmission is inherently effected by propagation delay. Furthermore, it is inherent that the dual mode mobile to have a memory/database to recognized the

Art Unit: 2663

Satellite identity code. Hence, when the Terrestrial service is lost in step 65, the service is handoff to the satellite system, step 82. One skilled in the art would have been motivated by Dent to include "a separate parameter" in Andresen to enable dual mode mobile stations.

Re Claim 9, refer to Claim 8, wherein the Satellite Identify code is indicative or Satellite or not.

## Response to Arguments

- 8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-14 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-3130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on 571-272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2663

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Al 7/19/05

> ANDY LEE PATENT EXAM